



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,691	08/08/2006	Noriyuki Asahara	HEI-018	3516
33628 7590 03/26/2008 KANESAKA BERNER AND PARTNERS LLP 1700 DIAGONAL RD SUITE 310 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2848				
EXAMINER				
ADDRESSEE, SARA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3722				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/26/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/583,691

Applicant(s)

ASAHARA ET AL.

Examiner

SARA ADDISU

Art Unit

3722

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/8/06.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/20/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is in claim format and contains legal phraseology, e.g. "comprising".. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "a bolt coupling the position member" (as claimed in claim 3) and the "space" (as claimed in claim 4) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New

Art Unit: 3722

Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. (USP 6,665,579), in view of Mihara et al. (JP 58132402).

SASAKI ET AL. teaches an automatic lathe which has a tool post (114) and a spindle (112) configured to relatively move in a spindle axis line direction and which machines a material (W) gripped by a chuck (117) at the tip of the spindle by use of a tool installed on the tool post, the automatic lathe, characterized by comprising: a head stock (113) configured to move forward and backward; the spindle (112) rotatably supported on the head stock and having a through-hole which allows the rod-like material (W) to be inserted there through; the tool post (114) equipped with the tool to

machine the material gripped by the chuck of the spindle; a rotatable guide bush (116) ('579, figure 1). SASAKI ET AL. also teaches head stock (113) which can move forward and backward in the same direction as the Z axis and spindle (112) being rotatably supported by the headstock (i.e. teaches spindle moving and fixing means) ('579, col. 1, lines 28-30). Furthermore, regarding claim 6, SASAKI ET AL. teaches transmission means (i.e. pulley (121b) rotated by a driving of motor (121a), and a belt (121c) running around the pulley (121b)) ('579, col. 2, lines 3-6). Regarding claim 5, SASAKI ET AL. teaches, toolpost base (110) which supports the tool post (114) ('579, figure 1). Regarding claim 7, SASAKI ET AL. teaches attachment (123a) fitted and fixed to the guide member and tip of the spindle (112).

However, SASAKI ET AL. fails to teach a guide bush support table.

MIHARA ET AL. teaches an automatic lathe having a headstock (3), spindle (3), guide bush (16) detachably fitted to a guide member supported on a guide bush support table (17) ('103, figures 1 & 2 and abstract). MIHARA ET AL. also teaches guide rails (2) for guiding the guide bush support table (17) backwards and forwards at a specified position on the bed (1). (note: although MIHARA ET AL. does not teach a support table coupled to the guide bush support table, it is old to have a support table such a carriage). Furthermore, MIHARA ET AL. is silent about spacers, however, it is known in a lathe environment to have spacers to prevent compensator misalignment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify SASAKI ET AL. such that it has a guide bush

support table, as taught by MIHARA ET AL. for the purpose of preventing bending deformation of a work piece ('103, abstract).

4. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. (USP 6,665,579), in view of Mihara et al. (JP 58132402) and further in view of Uchiumi et al. (JP 5-280532).

The modified device of SASAKI ET AL. teaches an automatic lathe having a tool post (114), a spindle (112), a chuck (117), a head stock (113), guide bush (116) and guide bush support table, as set forth in the above rejection.

However, the modified device of SASAKI ET AL. is silent about thermal expansion absorption member.

Uchiumi et al. teaches a spindle device whereby the main spindle head (1) and the rear bearing case (11) have a radial clearance (12) in relation to the inner housing (2) such that the thermal expansion of the main spindle is absorbed and a prescribed pressurization is always acting on a bearing by moving a rear bearing case in an axial direction freely and giving an elastic force into a rear direction ('532, figure 1 and abstract)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify SASAKI ET AL. such that it has a thermal

expansion absorption member, as taught by Uchiumi et al. for the purpose of improving the stability of the thermal displacement of a spindle tip in the main spindle device of a machine tool ('532, abstract).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sara Addisu at (571) 272-6082. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Monica Carter can be reached on (571) 272-4475. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 3722

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Sara Addisu/

Examiner, Art Unit 3722

3/12/08

/Monica S. Carter/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3722